

**From:** Wendel Bill J Contr MSG/MMF  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10, 2003 2:12 PM  
**Subject:** NewsCorp and DirecTV

Please do not allow the proposed purchase of DirecTV by NewsCorp to be completed.

NewsCorp already controls too many media sources and should not have the added control of distribution as well. From a business perspective it would be unfair to allow them to have that much horizontal and vertical power in the media market.

From a freedom of the press perspective, it is extremely dangerous to put DirecTV in the control of a corporation that is clearly biased to one side of the political spectrum.

Bill J. Wendel  
Tipp City, Ohio

**From:** Josh Engelhardt  
**To:** KathleenAbernathy  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10,2003 3:05 PM  
**Subject:** New deregulations

Please do not allow radio and tv owners to own more stations. The rules that were lifted in the early 90s destroyed radio. Growing up radio was a thing that brought you new ideas and inspired people and helped musicians reach people. Now it is just a constant run of advertising. Even the music is advertising. Please dont dumb down America's youth with these horrible deregulations.

Thank you  
Josh Engelhardt  
906 N 35th st  
Seattle WA 98103

**From:** Daniel Feldman  
**To:** Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein. Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10, 2003 3:20 PM  
**Subject:** Ownership rules

I wish to comment as a long time radio advertiser on the effects of relaxing ownership rules in media. Since the rules were relaxed in 1996, advertising prices have more than tripled. Creativity and diversity have all but been eliminated **as** the major stations have become homogenous shadows of their former selves. Whether it is Clear Channel stations, Infinity, Jefferson Pilot or Entercom (the **4** major players in Denver), the result has been the same across the board...far higher prices for a far worse product. New artists are not found on radio, but on the Internet and on **cable** TV where there is competition, not consolidation. Where does it make sense to allow a giant media corporation to own the concert venues the artists **MUST** play in (or lose valuable airplay? Where is any of this a benefit to the public good?

Even more disturbing is the corporate stamp and philosophy broadcast by every station regardless of audience composition. Most obvious is the overwhelming pro war stance of Clear Channel Communications on every one of their stations here. KTCL (93.3), who never runs a regular news program, is now running Gulf War news on an hourly basis with a Clear Channel promotion tag that is blatantly pro war. The Clear Channel Classic Rock station KRFX (103.5 FM), traditionally filled with frat humor revolving around sex and Harley's held a Support our Troops rally that **was** nothing more than a kick Saddam's butt promotion, though it was advertised as a rally for both pro war and pro peace people to come together to support the brave fighting men and women who do indeed put their lives on the line for our country. All this to bow to the politics of Clear Channel ownership instead of the public they serve.

For the record, I am not taking a stance one way or another on the war in this regard, however the same reports and promotional tag is carbon copied on every Clear Channel Station. There are even rumors in the trade here that Clear Channel put pressure on air personalities not to speak out against the war. This is not diversity. This does not bode well for public interest that these stations are supposed to be serving.

If you allow ownership consolidation to progress even further free speech on the public airwaves will all but disappear. If you allow big corporations to buy more market share, and even more stations, more advertisers will be priced out of the marketplace by ever increasing rates to pay for overpriced signals. The ownership rules should be tightened, not relaxed. There is way too much consolidation of the ownership of the radio airwaves today and in my opinion, it would be foolish to allow this trend to become an even bigger joke. The government has spent millions trying to break up IBM, Microsoft, AT&T and more, claiming too much power resided in one company. The mistake you are striving to take today will in future years have to be undone by future taxpayers.

Daniel Feldman  
Denver. CO

**CC:** john-mccain@mccain.senate.gov

**From:** Daniel Feldman  
**To:** Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10, 2003 3:20 PM  
**Subject:** Ownership rules

I wish to comment as a long time radio advertiser on the effects of relaxing ownership rules in media. Since the rules were relaxed in 1996, advertising prices have more than tripled. Creativity and diversity have all but been eliminated as the major stations have become homogenous shadows of their former selves. Whether it is Clear Channel stations, Infinity, Jefferson Pilot or Entercom (the 4 major players in Denver), the result has been the same across the board...far higher prices for a far worse product. New artists are not found on radio, but on the Internet and on cable TV where there is competition, not consolidation. Where does it make sense to allow a giant media corporation to own the concert venues the artists MUST play in (or lose valuable airplay? Where is any of this a benefit to the public good?

Even more disturbing is the corporate stamp and philosophy broadcast by every station regardless of audience composition. Most obvious is the overwhelming pro war stance of Clear Channel Communications on every one of their stations here. KTCL (93.3), who never runs a regular news program, is now running Gulf War news on an hourly basis with a Clear Channel promotion tag that is blatantly pro war. The Clear Channel Classic Rock station KRFX (103.5 FM), traditionally filled with frat humor revolving around sex and Harley's held a Support our Troops rally that was nothing more than a kick Saddam's butt promotion, though it was advertised as a rally for both pro war and pro peace people to come together to support the brave fighting men and women who do indeed put their lives on the line for our country. All this to bow to the politics of Clear Channel ownership instead of the public they serve.

For the record, I am not taking a stance one way or another on the war in this regard, however the same reports and promotional tag is carbon copied on every Clear Channel Station. There are even rumors in the trade here that Clear Channel put pressure on air personalities not to speak out against the war. This is not diversity. This does not bode well for public interest that these stations are supposed to be serving.

If you allow ownership consolidation to progress even further free speech on the public airwaves will all but disappear. If you allow big corporations to buy more market share, and even more stations, more advertisers will be priced out of the marketplace by ever increasing rates to pay for overpriced signals. The ownership rules should be tightened, not relaxed. There is way too much consolidation of the ownership of the radio airwaves today and in my opinion, it would be foolish to allow this trend to become an even bigger joke. The government has spent millions trying to break up IBM, Microsoft, AT&T and more, claiming too much power resided in one company. The mistake you are striving to take today will in future years have to be undone by future taxpayers.

Daniel Feldman  
Denver, CO

**CC:** john-mccain@mccain.senate.gov

**From:** Daniel Feldman  
**To:** Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10, 2003 3:20 PM  
**Subject:** Ownership rules

I wish to comment as a long time radio advertiser on the effects of relaxing ownership rules in media. Since the rules were relaxed in 1996, advertising prices have more than tripled. Creativity and diversity have all but been eliminated as the major stations have become homogenous shadows of their former selves. Whether it is Clear Channel stations, Infinity, Jefferson Pilot or Entercom (the 4 major players in Denver), the result has been the same across the board...far higher prices for a far worse product. New artists are not found on radio, but on the Internet and on cable *TV* where there is competition, not consolidation. Where does it make sense to allow a giant media corporation to own the concert venues the artists **MUST** play in (or lose valuable airplay? Where is any of this a benefit to the public good?

Even more disturbing is the corporate stamp and philosophy broadcast by every station regardless of audience composition. Most obvious **is** the overwhelming pro war stance of Clear Channel Communications on every one of their stations here. KTCL (93.3), who never runs a regular news program, is now running Gulf War news on an hourly basis with a Clear Channel promotion tag that is blatantly pro war. The Clear Channel Classic Rock station KRFX (103.5 FM), traditionally filled with frat humor revolving around sex and Harley's held a Support our Troops rally that was nothing more than a kick Saddam's butt promotion, though it was advertised as a rally for both pro war and pro peace people to come together to support the brave fighting men and women who do indeed put their lives on the line for our country. All this to bow to the politics of Clear Channel ownership instead of the public they serve.

For the record, I am not taking a stance one way or another on the war in this regard, however the same reports and promotional tag is carbon copied on every Clear Channel Station. There are even rumors in the trade here that Clear Channel put pressure on air personalities not to speak out against the war. This is not diversity. This does not bode well for public interest that these stations are supposed to be serving.

If you allow ownership consolidation to progress even further free speech on the public airwaves will all but disappear. If you allow big corporations to buy more market share, and even more stations, more advertisers will be priced out of the marketplace by ever increasing rates to pay for overpriced signals. The ownership rules should be tightened, not relaxed. There is way too much consolidation of the ownership of the radio airwaves today and in my opinion, it would be foolish to allow this trend to become an even bigger joke. The government has spent millions trying to break up IBM, Microsoft, AT&T and more, claiming too much power resided in one company. The mistake you are striving to take today will in future years have to be undone by future taxpayers.

Daniel Feldman  
Denver, CO

**CC:** john-mccain@mccain.senate.gov

**From:** Sandi Spires  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10, 2003 3:34 PM  
**Subject:** Re: FCC may rescind rules that limit media ownership

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am writing to you to express my support for the rules limiting media ownership. These are good guidelines: they serve the public interest. Keep them in place!

Already the bulk of radio stations are owned by a single company. Not surprising, I find **less** diversity on the radio today than I found 20 years ago; despite an increase in the number of stations I can reach.

Similarly, despite the 50+ television stations I receive, I find **less** and **less** diversity of opinion or programming. When a single company owns various outlets, it does not (as some assert) promote different agendas for each one. Rather, each is limited to a single corporate vision.

Sincerely,  
Sandi Spires  
Sunnyvale, CA

excerpt below:

The Denver Business Journal -January 13,2003  
<http://denver.bizjournals.com/denver/stories/2003/013/newscolumn3.html>

From the January 10, 2003 print edition  
Telecom

FCC may rescind rules that limit media ownership

Amy Bryer

...

If the Federal Communications Commission chair, Michael Powell, gets his way, the agency might scrap rules in the next few weeks that restrict the ownership of multiple media outlets in the same market - like the Fox example - and possibly diminish consumer choices for news.

(c) 2003 American City Business Journals Inc.

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Sandi Spires  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10, 2003 3:34 PM  
**Subject:** Re: FCC may rescind rules that limit media ownership

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am writing to you to express my support for the rules limiting media ownership. These are good guidelines; they **serve** the public interest. Keep them in place!

Already the bulk of radio stations are owned by a single company. Not surprising, I find **less** diversity on the radio today than I found 20 years ago; despite an increase in the number of stations I can reach.

Similarly, despite the 50+ television stations I receive, I find **less** and **less** diversity of opinion or programming. When a single company owns various outlets, it does not (as some assert) promote different agendas for each one. Rather, each is limited to a single corporate vision.

Sincerely,  
Sandi Spires  
Sunnyvale, CA

excerpt below:

The Denver Business Journal - January 13, 2003  
<http://denver.bizjournals.com/denver/stories/2003/01/13/newscolumn3.html>

From the January 10, 2003 print edition  
Telecom

FCC may rescind rules that limit media ownership

Amy Bryer

...

If the Federal Communications Commission chair, Michael Powell, gets his way, the agency might scrap rules in the next few weeks that restrict the ownership of multiple media outlets in the same market - like the Fox example - and possibly diminish consumer choices for news.

...

(c) 2003 American City Business Journals Inc.



**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy. Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Murphy, Richard  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10, 2003 4:18 PM  
**Subject:** station ownership

Dear Commissioner,

I understand the FCC is considering relaxing the cap on the number radio stations a company can own.

I feel this is a wrong course for Radio. We are seeing the making of a monopoly in Radio broadcasting. At least with the advent of cable and satellite TV, viewers have choice. If one company owns a majority of the radio signals in a market, choice and variety is no longer an option to the radio listener. As a 20 year radio professional I have seen the industry consolidate and the quality and variety of product available to the community dwindle. Relaxing of these rules creates two major problems. 1. Small broadcast companies offering a different product and 2. unemployment.

1. Companies like Clear Channel eliminate any new competition to come to the market. I could open a hardware store today to compete with the one down the street, but because there are no new radio signals signing on. You have to buy what's available. In Denver to buy a decent signal you're looking at 80-120 million dollars, with the idea that Clear Channel owns a majority of Denver radio. Fair competition requires a level playing field. That currently does not exist in sales, and programming. Sales has to compete with Clear Channel saying to an advertiser buy station 1 and we will bonus your commercials on stations 2, 3, and 4. Programmingwise Clear Channel says to an artists play a show for one of our competitors and we will pull your music off all Clear Channel stations. Play concert for Clear Channel concerts or we will do the same. Relaxing the rules only makes a playing field favor large companies like Clear Channel even more. Where the mom and pop stations have no opportunity to offer any type of value or quality radio to the listener because of the big bully on the block. These companies realize they won't generate the advertising dollars of a Clear Channel but at least they should have a chance to come into the market and compete.

2. From an internal employment point of view relaxing the owner ship rules will allow companies like Clear Channel to implement their programming philosophy of an Announcer voice tracking multiple markets from one location. I know for a fact that one disc jockey will voice as many a 13 markets a day. 13 communities, cities, stations, with out local broadcasters being able to communicate to their audience. This practice is not only a disservice to the listener but also is contributing to the unemployment of Americans. 12 Announcers out of work and that one announcer that is working is not making the salary of 13 Discjockeys. They are told to do it or lose your job to some who will.

We are on verge of Radio being controlled by a couple of companies in top 250 markets in the United States. Fair market competition and the employment of broadcast professionals like my self are on the verge of being a casualty of your decision. They days of 20 years ago where 30 stations in Denver owned by 10 -15 owners a thing of the past. tomorrow it could be 30 stations owned by 3 broadcast companies.

Diversity in the number of broadcasters in a market offers variety and

quality programming. The winner is the communities and the listeners served by those stations.

Thank for your time and consideration

Richard Werry  
4268 South Argonne Street  
Aurora, CO  
80013

**From:** Mhandrh@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10, 2003 9:38 PM  
**Subject:** media ownership

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners:

Limits on media ownership are not limits on free speech. On the contrary, consolidation **is** a form of self-serving censorship **by** the corporations. I urge limits be placed to halt the increasing corporate ownership of media broadcasting.

Marie Harris  
Bartlett, IL 60103

**From:** Mhandrh@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10, 2003 9:38 PM  
**Subject:** media ownership

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners:

Limits on media ownership are not limits on free speech. On the contrary, consolidation is a form of self-serving censorship by the corporations. I urge limits be placed to halt the increasing corporate ownership of media broadcasting.

Marie Harris  
Bartlett, IL 60103

**From:** Mhandrh@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Apr 10, 2003 9:38 PM  
**Subject:** media ownership

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners:

Limits on media ownership are not limits on free speech. On the contrary, consolidation is a form of self-serving censorship by the corporations. I urge limits be placed to halt the increasing corporate ownership of media broadcasting.

Marie Harris  
Bartlett, IL 60103

**From:** Ferrance@aol.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 11, 2003 7:35 AM  
**Subject:** Fairness doctrine

Please reinstate the Fairness Doctrine to ensure balance in the media. Thank you.  
Francis J. Ferrance, Ph.D., J.D.

**From:** Sam Slack  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 11, 2003 12:59 PM  
**Subject:** deregulation of media

----- Original Message -----

From: Sam Slack <sam.slack@worldnet.att.net>  
To: <mcopps@fcc.gov>  
Sent: Friday, April 11, 2003 12:53 PM  
Subject: Ref: deregulation of media

> Dear Commissioner Copps:  
>  
> Please let this e-mail serve as my formal complaint and objection to any  
> pending  
> FCC rulings which may lift restrictions on mergers between TV broadcast  
> networks and the number of local TV or radio stations owned by any one  
> company. Such deregulation threatens to further stifle the diversity of  
> programming for consumers, advertisers and producers. One of the main  
> responsibilities of the FCC is to promote diversity, which doesn't just  
> refer  
> to people of color... it refers to many different types of programming. I  
> applaud you Commissioner Copps for attempting to draw attention to  
> this problem. I, and other Americans as well, are opposed to further  
media  
> deregulation. I hope you will act on our behalf to STOP further media  
> deregulation.  
>  
> Respectfully yours,  
>  
> Sam L. Slack  
>

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, KM **KJMWEB**, Commissioner Adelstein



**From:** mohn@galaxytowers.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 11, 2003 1:59 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

**Sincerely,**

**Jim Mohn  
7000 Blvd. East  
Gitttrnberg. New Jersey 07093**

**From:** mohn@galaxytowers.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 11, 2003 1:59 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Jim Mohn  
7000 Blvd. East  
Gitttrnberg, New Jersey 07093

**From:** presidentcwa3120@mindspring.com  
**To:** KathleenAbernathy  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 11, 2003 2:16 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Bill Tracy  
**314 S 62 Ave**  
Hollywood, Florida 33023

**From:** presidentcwa31ZO@mindspring.com  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 11, 2003 2:16 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael C. Copps,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Bill Tracy  
314 S 62 Ave  
Hollywood, Florida 33023



**From:** Dihoffmn@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps. KM KJMWEB. Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 11, 2003 2:53 PM  
**Subject:** letter to FCC Board

4/11/03

Dear FCC Board Member:

I am writing to express my opposition to further deregulation of radio and TV ownership.

I fail to see how deregulation can accomplish the strategic goals of the FCC as reported on the FCC web site. I believe success in accomplishing these goals requires the FCC to recommit the Commission to increasing the diversity of ownership to truly ensure competition of ideas and expression. Media that is open to diversity of ideas is essential for a healthy, vigorous democracy. Diversity requires expanding ownership of media outlets not concentration of ownership in the hands of fewer and fewer entities

I understand The FCC is considering relaxing the rules that limit how much of the national television audience a single entity can reach. Specifically, by reviewing proposals that would remove rules that prevent a single company from owning more than one of the top four television stations in a given market. I also understand The FCC is considering removing controls on common ownership of television and radio stations or newspapers and broadcast stations in a market, specifically by allowing mergers among the major existing networks.

When I went on the FCC web site [www.fcc.gov](http://www.fcc.gov) I examined the very interesting and revealing study on cable system availability and ownership for 10 selected radio markets in 1960, 1980 and 2000. I am sure you are familiar with the study.

The figures in the study showed that in 1980 there were 3.97 entities per owner. In 2000 there were 9.61 entities per owner. The study also showed the growth of cable households in the communities. The total cable households grew from 1,328,461 in 1980 to 4,421,380 in 2000. Can you imagine what those numbers are today! Fewer and fewer people are already influencing larger and larger audiences by virtue of the content of their programming and advertising.

Concentration of ownership is growing without further deregulation!

We can show the empirical evidence required by the District Court by pointing to the absence of diverse media in the former Soviet Union and the current lack of diverse media perspectives in many Middle Eastern, Asian, African and South American countries today and the problem that poses in presenting different perspectives of current events in these countries. The rules are necessary to ensure we do not go in the same direction as those countries.

In 1945 the Supreme Court ruled that "the widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources is essential to the welfare of the people." The Fairness Doctrine that was upheld by the Supreme Court in 1969 stated that "airwaves are a public trust" and fairness requires that

the airwaves must accurately reflected differences of opinion." This further supports the **1945** decision.

The free competition of ideas is crucial to our future growth and survival. By allowing greater concentration of ownership, the FCC will greatly reduce the likelihood that media will reflect a true plurality of opinions, invite honest debate, encourage analytical thinking or discuss ideas that are unpopular with the government. Access to information and opposing viewpoints is vital if we hope to be able to critically evaluate information and make reasoned responsible decisions that affect our lives and future.

Our forefathers were so concerned about ensuring freedom of speech and the press they made it a part of the first amendment to the Constitution. I am counting on you to protect this essential characteristic of Democracy and support movement toward a freer and more diverse media in America. Deregulation, which allows further concentration of media in the hands of fewer entities is a dagger in the heart of our Democracy.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

Diane Hoffman

**From:** WTHORPE@cwa-union.org  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Fri, Apr 11, 2003 4:05 PM  
**Subject:** Preserve Media Diversity: Keep the FCC Rulemaking an Open Process

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is currently considering sweeping changes to broadcast ownership rules. Repeal or significant modification of these rules would likely open the door to numerous mergers that could reduce competition and diversity in the media.

Before the media ownership rules are issued in final form, the public must have the opportunity to review and comment on any specific changes the Commission plans to make.

If media ownership rules are seriously weakened, one company in a town could control the most popular newspaper, TV station, and possibly even a cable system giving it dominant influence over the content and slant of local news. Such a move would reduce the diversity of cultural and political discussion in a community. It could also raise costs for businesses and candidates that use local media for advertising.

While the Commission issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on media ownership, it proposed no actual rule. Accordingly, no public comment has been received on any specific changes. We believe that additional input from the public will help the Commission see the strengths and weaknesses of any new approach.

I encourage you to provide a detailed description of all proposed changes, their empirical basis, and a meaningful period of time for the public to review and comment on any proposed changes before a final rule is issued.

The stakes for citizens and the nation are enormous. More information, not less, about proposed changes would best serve the public interest. Indeed, we hope the Commission would do everything in its power to keep the rulemaking process as open and inclusive as possible.

Sincerely,

Mr. Willie Thorpe  
2360 West Dorothy Lane  
Dayton, Ohio 45439

**From:** Marc Daniel  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Wed, Apr 9, 2003 4:37 PM  
**Subject:** Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Marc Daniel

**From:** Marc Daniel  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Wed, Apr 9, 2003 4:37 PM  
**Subject:** Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Marc Daniel

**From:** Marc Daniel  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Wed, Apr 9.2003 4:37 PM  
**Subject:** Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Marc Daniel

From: Marc Daniel  
To: Michael Copps  
Date: Wed, Apr 9, 2003 4:37 PM  
Subject: 'Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Marc Daniel